

REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 7, 2005. Claims 1-23 are pending in this application with claims 1, 10 and 18-23 in independent form. It is submitted that no new matter has been added and no new issues have been raised by the present Amendment.

Applicant carefully reviewed the application in light of the comments made in the Office Actions and it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-23 are in condition for allowance.

The disclosure was objected to because reference character "210" on page 6, lines 8-9 and 10 was used to refer to the display and such usage is inconsistent with the drawings in that Fig. 2C designates the display with reference character "216". By the present amendment, Applicant has amended the paragraph beginning on page 6 at line 8 to correct these minor errors.

The disclosure was further objected to because the specification incorporates by reference an application that is identified by title only. The Office Action contends that the reference is incomplete because the application date and filing number are not provided. By the present Amendment, Applicant has amended the paragraph beginning on page 2 at line 5 to include the requested information.

Accordingly, in light of the amendments made herein, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 10, and 18-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,787,252 to Schettler et al. Claims 4, 5, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schettler et al. in light of U.S. Published Application No. 2003/0046390 to Ball et al. Claims 3, 6-8, 11 and 14-16 were

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Schettler et al. in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0069952 to Tams et al.

Schettler et al. as understood by Applicant, relates to a filtering system and method for permitting high performance generation of a network management map of a data communication network. See Schettler et al, Col. 1, lines 5-10. As understood by Applicant, discovery/layout software includes a discovery mechanism and a layout mechanism which permit the discovery/layout software to provide various submaps to a display for illustrating network topology, which includes devices and device interconnections of a network. The submaps correspond to various hierarchical views of a network. One or more filtering systems may be provided for filtering objects to be displayed in the submaps. The filtering systems reduce clutter in the submaps reduce memory usage and associated expense and reduce interprocess communication. See Schettler et al., Abstract.

Claim 1 of the present application relates to a method for analyzing links between components of a computer system comprising receiving input associated with a level of abstraction, determining the level of abstraction based on the input, filtering network links for display based on the level of abstraction and displaying the filtered network links to present a layered network diagram.

The Office Action contends that Schettler et al. allegedly discloses “receiving input associated with a level of abstraction” and “determining the level of abstraction based on the input” as recited in claim 1 of the present application, for example. The Office Action further cites Column 7, lines 19-35 as allegedly supporting this disclosure. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Schettler et al. defines filters as boolean expressions of database files and values. As understood by Applicant, Schettler et al. further indicates that any suitable set of boolean expressions can be utilized within the filters and that the operands of the boolean operators

are either field names or actual values to which database field values are compared. See Schettler et al., Column 7, lines 7-18. Schettler et al. also appears to indicate that filter expressions allow multiple filters to be applied to a set of objects without requiring a new filter which is just the logical combination of others wherein the only valid operands for a filter expression are filters previously defined in the same filter file. Any suitable set of boolean expressions may be used in the filter expressions although it is preferable that a different set of boolean expressions be used in the filter expressions than is used in the filters. Schettler et al. further indicates that the user is provided with three different ways for a user to specify the filtering specifications. *Id.* at lines 19-35. That is, Schettler et al. appears to indicate that users specify the filtering specifications. As understood by Applicant, Shettler et al. provides no teaching or suggestion whatever of a level of abstraction.

Accordingly, as understood by Applicant, Schettler et al., fails to teach or suggest “receiving input associated with a level of abstraction” and “determining the level of abstraction based on the input” as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is patentably distinct from the cited art for at least the reasons mentioned above. The other independent claims are believed to be patentably distinct for at least similar reasons.

In light of the amendments and remarks herein, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-23 are patentable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above.


The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required in connection with this Amendment and to credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite fees to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Entry of this Amendment and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



RICHARD F. JAWORSKI
Reg. No.33,515
KEITH J. BARKAUS
Reg. No. 51,431
Attorney for Applicants
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel.: (212) 278-0400